

August 7, 2024

**VIA ECF**

Honorable Paul A. Engelmayer  
 United States District Court, Southern District of New York  
 Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse  
 40 Foley Square  
 New York, NY 10007

Re: *Jane Street Group LLC v. Millennium Management LLC*, 24-cv-2783 (PAE)

Dear Judge Engelmayer,

Defendants submit this response to Plaintiff's letter motion for an extension (Dkt. 192, 195-1). Jane Street's motion was premature, as Jane Street proceeded with the motion before giving Defendants adequate time to consider the proposal or have a meet and confer.<sup>1</sup>

Notwithstanding Jane Street's failure to meet and confer, based on Plaintiff's representation that it "is willing to provide Defendants with the custodians requested" (Dkt. 192 at 1)<sup>2</sup> and the volume of documents it assumes are within its review universe (Dkt. 192 at 3 n.6), Defendants have consented to the proposed schedule to avoid burdening the Court. For the avoidance of doubt, Defendants do not accept many of the representations in Jane Street's letter, but do not need to burden the Court with a point by point response. Defendants reserve all rights.

Defendants therefore respectfully request that the Court So Order the revised case management plan at Dkt. 195-2.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Rollo C. Baker*

Rollo C. Baker  
 ELSBERG BAKER & MARURI PLLC  
 One Penn Plaza, Suite 4015  
 New York, NY 10119  
 rbaker@elsberglaw.com

*Counsel for Defendants*  
*Douglas Schadewald and*  
*Daniel Spottiswood*

*/s/ May Chiang*

May Chiang  
 DECHERT LLP  
 1095 Avenue of the Americas  
 New York, NY 10036  
 may.chiang@dechert.com

*Counsel for Defendant*  
*Millennium Management LLC*

<sup>1</sup> Jane Street notified Defendants of its request for an extension at 9 pm on August 1, asking for a response the next day by 12 pm. When Defendants advised that Jane Street that they were amenable to an extension but would need further time to consider the proposal, Jane Street instead informed Defendants that it would be proceeding with the motion and filed on August 2.

<sup>2</sup> Jane Street had not previously notified Defendants that it was willing to agree to the narrowed set of custodians that Defendants requested on July 22. Prior to Plaintiff's August 2<sup>nd</sup> letter to the Court, it had only agreed to add two custodians and expressed its view that the remaining eight primarily relevant to the trading strategies were "unnecessary."

